

AD \_\_\_\_\_

AWARD NUMBER DAMD17-94-J-4360

TITLE: Facility Inreach Strategy to Promote Annual Mammography

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joni A. Mayer, Ph.D.

CONTRACTING ORGANIZATION: San Diego State University Foundation  
San Diego, California 92182-1900

REPORT DATE: October 1998

TYPE OF REPORT: Annual

PREPARED FOR: U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command  
Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: Approved for Public Release;  
Distribution Unlimited

The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision unless so designated by other documentation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE October 1998	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Annual (1 Oct 97 - 30 Sep 98)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Facility Inreach Strategy to Promote Annual Mammography			5. FUNDING NUMBERS DAMD17-94-J-4360	
6. AUTHOR(S) Joni A. Mayer, Ph.D.				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) San Diego State University Foundation San Diego, California 92182-1900			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			19991130 044	
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)  The purpose of this study is to increase annual return rates for screening mammography among asymptomatic women 50 - 74 years. The study tested the effectiveness of a physician endorsed reminder letter relative to a standard mammography facility reminder letter and to no intervention. Six mammography facilities and 82 referring physicians participated. Physician participation rates ranged from 35-67% across facilities. Over the course of the 23 month recruitment period, 3,701 eligible women were approached and 1,971 (53%) of those consented to participate. Of the 1,971 consenting women, 108 women subsequently had positive mammograms and were excluded from the study, leaving 1,863 subjects. All subjects were interviewed by phone regarding knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to mammography. Overall, 1,818 telephone interviews were completed. Primary outcome data were available for 1,562 subjects. Forty-eight percent of subjects in the physician endorsed group returned within the 8-week monitoring period, 47% in the standard facility group, and 28% in the control group; the overall difference among return rates was significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). Bonferroni pairwise comparisons indicated there was no difference between the physician endorsed and standard facility groups. However, both of these groups had significantly higher return rates than the control group.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Breast Cancer Mammography, Adherence, Appointment Reminder, Screening Guidelines, Inreach, Humans, Clinical Trials, Intervention, Physician Advice			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 56	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unlimited	

## FOREWORD

Opinions, interpretations, conclusions and recommendations are those of the author and are not necessarily endorsed by the U.S. Army.

\_\_\_\_ Where copyrighted material is quoted, permission has been obtained to use such material.

\_\_\_\_ Where material from documents designated for limited distribution is quoted, permission has been obtained to use the material.

\_\_\_\_ Citations of commercial organizations and trade names in this report do not constitute an official Department of Army endorsement or approval of the products or services of these organizations.

\_\_\_\_ In conducting research using animals, the investigator(s) adhered to the "Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals," prepared by the Committee on Care and use of Laboratory Animals of the Institute of Laboratory Resources, national Research Council (NIH Publication No. 86-23, Revised 1985).

*JM* For the protection of human subjects, the investigator(s) adhered to policies of applicable Federal Law 45 CFR 46.

\_\_\_\_ In conducting research utilizing recombinant DNA technology, the investigator(s) adhered to current guidelines promulgated by the National Institutes of Health.

\_\_\_\_ In the conduct of research utilizing recombinant DNA, the investigator(s) adhered to the NIH Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules.

\_\_\_\_ In the conduct of research involving hazardous organisms, the investigator(s) adhered to the CDC-NIH Guide for Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories.

*Jon Mayer* 10-16-98  
PI - Signature Date

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. FRONT COVER .....	1
II. REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE .....	2
III. FOREWORD .....	3
IV. TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	4
V. INTRODUCTION .....	6
Description of the Subject .....	6
Background of Previous Work .....	7
Purpose of the Present Work and Scope of the Research .....	8
VI. BODY .....	9
Experimental Methods .....	9
Overview of Project .....	9
Strategies to Enhance Participation .....	10
Study Facilities .....	10
Referring Physicians .....	11
Subjects .....	12
Inclusion of Minorities .....	14
Intervention Procedures .....	14
Measures and Assessment Procedures .....	15
Pre-Intervention Survey .....	15
Measurement of Outcome .....	17
Other Measures .....	17
Statistical Analysis .....	17
Results .....	19
Facility Recruitment .....	19
Physician Recruitment .....	19
Subject Recruitment .....	20
Subject Attrition .....	21

	Survey Data .....	21
	Outcome Data .....	21
	Participating Physician Questionnaire .....	24
	Mammography Facility Interviews .....	25
VII.	CONCLUSIONS .....	26
VIII.	REFERENCES .....	27
IX.	APPENDICES .....	29
	APPENDIX A .....	29
	APPENDIX B .....	31
	APPENDIX C .....	33
	APPENDIX D .....	48
	APPENDIX E .....	52

## INTRODUCTION

### Description of the Subject

Breast cancer is the most prevalent type of cancer and the second leading cause of cancer-related mortality in American women (1). In 1998, there will be an estimated 178,700 new cases among women in the U.S. and 43,900 breast cancer deaths (1). Although progress has been made in the medical treatment of breast cancer, early detection and treatment continue to be the best predictors of an improved prognosis (1;2). Mammography is clearly the most sensitive and specific method of early detection (3). Results from large scale trials have shown a decrease in mortality by up to 33% in women aged 50 and older (4). Currently the American Cancer Society (ACS), and other agencies recommend annual mammograms for women 50 and older.

As noted in a review of the literature published prior to the initiation of our study (5), results from surveys showed positive secular trends in rates of both "ever" mammograms and in mammograms in the past year. However, adherence to the screening guidelines that are needed to reduce breast cancer mortality continued to be low (6-11). In the four studies that examined the rates and correlates of interval adherence, the rates of "more than 1" mammogram for women 50+ were 23%, 34%, 45%, and 47% (8-11). In all studies, physician recommendation consistently predicted repeat screening.

Mammography screening at regular intervals involves an interplay between the primary (or referring) physician, the patient, and the mammography provider (12). Following the initial mammogram, the mammography provider has information about the patient, and is able to conduct inreach activities to increase return rates. Mammography facilities routinely use reminder strategies to encourage patients to return. In an urban area where numerous facilities are competing, increased return rates may be crucial to keep revenues up. A collaboration between these facilities and public health interventionists has the potential to serve both public health and business objectives. Moreover, the probability for institutionalizing an intervention is high if the program increases revenues for the facility.

At the time the present study began, only three studies (excluding a pilot study described in the following section) had evaluated facility-based strategies to increase mammography return rates. In one study (13), return rates for a reassuring letter, an anxiety-provoking letter, and a "standard" hospital reminder letter were 54%, 42%, and 38% (n.s.). Our research group conducted two studies at a hospital-based mammography center comparing the standard reminder letter with other interventions (14). In Study 1, mailed reminder and reminder-plus-incentive subjects had appointment completion rates of 36% and 32%, respectively (n.s.). In Study 2, mailed reminder and telephoned subjects had appointment completion rates of 44% and 48%, respectively (n.s.). In contrast, in a meta-analysis, mailed reminders were consistently useful in reducing broken appointments (15). Reminder letters have been successful in promoting general

mammography appointment adherence (16) and cervical screening appointment adherence (17,18) relative to no letters.

In sum, studies have shown that reminder letters can increase medical appointment compliance in general and cancer screening appointments specifically. However, in the area of mammography adherence, there is a lack of trials to evaluate reminder strategies using true control groups and focusing on interval adherence. Because of the importance of physician recommendation as a facilitator in mammography interval adherence, incorporating the physician's endorsement of screening in a reminder strategy appears warranted.

### Background of Previous Work

Studies 1 and 2. Two intervention pilots were conducted at the same facility during December, 1991 to March 1992 to evaluate the effects of various strategies on return rates of asymptomatic women, having no history of breast cancer, aged 50+ (14). In Study 1, all 50+ patients seen at the facility in 1-91 (N=187) were randomly assigned to receive the usual facility reminder postcard or the postcard plus a voucher for a small gift (valued at \$2.00) the month of the return date. In Study 2, all patients seen at the facility in 2-91 (N=184) were randomly assigned to receive either the postcard or a telephone reminder. During the phone call, patients were given the opportunity to schedule their appointment. Appointment completion rates (i.e., scheduled and kept the appointment) were monitored for the target appointment month plus one additional month.

Within both studies, groups were comparable on age (mean=64). In Study 1, the reminder only and reminder plus incentive groups had return rates of 36% and 32%, respectively (n.s.). The results were not in the predicted direction. Only 10 of 96 coupons were returned. In Study 2, mailed reminder and telephoned reminder subjects had appointment completion rates of 44% and 48%, respectively (n.s.). Only 26% of the phoned subjects scheduled appointments at the time of the call. The added expense of the calls was not justified by the 4% increase in return rates. Given the emerging literature (9-11,19), we reasoned that a mailed prompting strategy that emphasized the primary care physician's recommendation for annual mammography would be more powerful than the standard mailed prompt without being prohibitively labor-intensive. There was also a need to systematically estimate the effects of no reminders on return rates. Consequently, a third intervention pilot was conducted.

Study 3. This intervention was the prototype for the present study (14). The facility, which had been in business for 6 years and was affiliated with a hospital, provided approximately 4,224 screening mammograms per year and worked with approximately 428 referring physicians. Prior to the study, physicians who were frequent referrers to this facility were asked for their consent for the facility to prompt their patients using their letterhead and randomly assign their patients to the intervention or control (delayed reminder) group. Of the 19 physicians who were contacted, 15 (79%) agreed to participate. Within each physician, women aged 50+ without a breast cancer history who

had been referred to this facility in November, 1991 and who had a negative screening mammogram were randomly assigned to the two groups, resulting in 32 women in the intervention group and 31 women in the control group. Reminders stating the physician's endorsement of annual screening were mailed to intervention subjects the last week of October, 1992. The facility based reminders that the facility routinely uses were withheld from all subjects; control subjects received them at the end of the study. Return rates during November and December of 1992 were monitored.

The median ages of subjects in the reminder and control groups were 61 and 62, respectively (Range=52-91). Ninety percent were aged 52 to 75. The outcome was encouraging: return rates for the reminder and control groups were 47% and 19%, respectively,  $\chi^2(1) = 5.29$ ,  $p < .05$ . This was a relative increase of 147%. The chart review 14 month return rate for this facility, which used a "standard" reminder, was 26%. With the exception of two subjects who were both in the reminder group, all subjects who returned did so during November. The success of the intervention in this controlled pilot study warranted a larger trial.

#### Purpose of the Present Work and Scope of the Research

The primary purpose of this study is to increase annual return rates for screening mammography among asymptomatic women aged 50 and older. Specific project objectives include:

- a. To develop an intervention aimed at promoting return mammogram adherence within 12-14 months following the last mammogram. The intervention will consist of an appointment reminder letter mailed by the mammography facility but originating from the referring physician; the physician will endorse the importance of annual screening for the patient.
- b. To refine and standardize a comparison reminder letter. Typically used by mammography providers, this letter will originate from the facility to encourage return appointments.
- c. To implement and monitor the proposed interventions at six mammography facilities in San Diego, California that have adequate patient volume to meet sample size requirements. Cooperation of primary care providers that refer patients to these facilities will be obtained.
- d. To evaluate the effectiveness of the primary care physician's letter in increasing return mammogram adherence relative to the "standard" facility letter and to no intervention. The study will use a three group, randomized design with at least 1,560 subjects randomized from within referring physician within mammography facility. We hypothesize that the physician letter will produce significantly higher adherence than

the standard letter, and that the standard letter will produce significantly higher adherence than no letter.

A secondary purpose is to increase the understanding of the factors that influence interval adherence to mammography. Specific objectives relevant to this goal are:

- a. To assess via a phone interview selected demographic, psychosocial, health-related, health services, and mammography-experience related variables within approximately 4-8 weeks after a screening mammogram.
- b. To evaluate prospectively relationships between these variables and subsequent mammogram adherence, controlling for study condition.

## BODY

### Experimental Methods

#### Overview of Project

The study used a randomized three-group design to compare the effects of two interventions and a control condition on annual return rates to mammography facilities for screening mammograms by women 50-74 years. The treatments included a) delayed appointment reminder (control), b) "standard" reminder -- appointment reminder from the facility that provided last year's mammogram, and c) physician endorsement reminder -- appointment with physician's prompt to patient to have an annual mammogram at the facility.

Study procedures were as follows for subjects in a given wave: a) potential subjects were approached by the project at or around the time of the study entry mammogram; b) subject consent forms were completed and collected; c) verification was made that the entry mammogram had negative results; d) the interview was conducted within approximately 8 weeks of the study entry mammogram; e) approximately eleven months after being recruited, subjects were randomly assigned to groups; f) for subjects in the standard reminder and physician endorsement reminder groups, reminder letters were mailed the day before the first day of the targeted appointment month; g) staff monitored facility appointment records to evaluate return rates of subjects within 60 days (of day 1) of the targeted appointment month; h) reminder letters were mailed to control group subjects on the last day of the 60 day monitoring period. Staff currently monitors facility appointment records to evaluate return rates of subjects within 6 months (of day 1) of the targeted appointment month.

Measurement procedures consisted of a) a 43 item telephone interview within approximately 4-8 weeks following the study entry mammogram to obtain information

on demographic characteristics, mammography history, perceptions of the mammography experience, selected health history, knowledge of mammography guidelines, health beliefs specific to breast cancer and mammography, intentions to have a subsequent annual mammogram, self-efficacy for obtaining annual mammography, and access to medical care; b) monitoring facility appointment records to evaluate return rates of subjects within 60 days (of day 1) of the targeted appointment month; and c) monitoring facility appointment records to evaluate return rates of subjects within 6 months (of day 1) of the targeted appointment month.

We originally planned to conduct the study at four mammography facility sites (called "original sites"). After several months of subject recruitment at the original sites, we determined that we would not be able to reach the required sample size and decided to recruit two additional facilities. Two additional facilities were recruited during the grant year 1995-1996. Random assignment of subjects to groups occurred within each facility and each referring physician. In order to achieve the final sample size of 1,560 subjects (520 per group), subject recruitment was extended through April, 1997. A total of 1,863 subjects were recruited. The interviews and intervention were implemented in a staggered manner, with each lasting approximately 23 months (with overlap).

#### Strategies to Enhance Participation

The success of the project was dependent on adequate levels of participation by facilities, referring physicians, and subjects. Moreover, high response rates of each enhances the generalizability of the findings. Consequently, strategies for encouraging participation at each level were used. The research team includes a general practitioner, Linda Hill, M.D., M.P.H., who has provided consultation on the intervention from the referring physician's and patient's perspective and a radiologist, Charles Lee, M.D., J.D., who has consulted on quality assurance of mammography and other facility-related issues. The input of these consultants helped assure that the intervention was acceptable to patients, referring physicians, and mammography providers.

#### Study Facilities

Inclusion criteria for sites were: a) patient volume can accommodate approximately one-sixth of the sample; b) computerized or manual record keeping system appears accurate and efficient; c) personnel at site agree to follow study protocol (e.g., delay reminders for control group); d) facility is certified by the California Department of Health Services (CDHS) Radiologic Health Branch, is accredited by the American College of Radiology (ACR), and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) e) facility uses a fee-for-service model; and f) facility has been in business for at least one year prior to the study's onset.

Generally, facilities are very interested in improving patient services, enhancing relationships with referring physicians, and increasing their revenues. They were told that these are three potential benefits of participating in the study via the introductory

packet we mailed. Initially, project staff sent facility directors a packet containing the following: an introductory cover letter, pilot study results, a sample of the physician-endorsed reminder letter, and a chart stating the responsibilities of participating facilities and the project staff (timeline for all activities included). Next, phone calls were placed and face to face meetings were held.

We completed recruitment of the four original sites in January, 1995. South Bay Radiology is located in the southern portion of the county (Chula Vista), has a high proportion of Latinas who primarily speak Spanish (approximately 50% of patient population), and performs 30-35 screening mammograms a day. The Alvarado Breast Center is located in central San Diego county, has a Caucasian, middle class patient population, and performs 15-20 screening mammograms a day. The UCSD Center for Women's Health is also located in central San Diego County, has a diverse patient population, and performs 10-15 screening mammograms a day. Our fourth original site, the Lybrand Mammography and Education Center at Scripps Memorial Hospital, is located in northern San Diego county, has a primarily mid-upper income Caucasian patient population and performs 10-15 screening mammograms a day.

The second phase of facility recruitment was completed in March, 1996. Mercy Hospital Women's Imaging Center is located in central San Diego County, has a diverse patient population, and performs 10 screening mammograms a day. Tri-City Outpatient Imaging Center is located in the northwestern part of the county, has a primarily middle class patient population, and performs 20-30 screening mammograms a day.

Initial recruitment and continued participation by facilities has been assisted by minimizing the burden on facility staff for data monitoring and intervention procedures. All procedures that involve the facility's assistance (e.g., data monitoring) are as efficient as possible and are coordinated with the facility's schedule. An initial annual meeting was held at each of the study facilities as a forum for facility and project staffs to discuss study progress and share ideas for streamlining study procedures. Initial annual meetings were held in 1995-1996. A second set of annual meetings were held between April and June, 1997 to discuss the completion of subject recruitment, intervention progress, and appreciation for facility cooperation. A final set of annual meetings will be scheduled in the Fall of 1998 or Winter of 1999 to share study results.

### Referring Physicians

Prior to the physician recruitment phase of the study, approximately 23 physicians were questioned to assess any concerns with the intervention procedures via one focus group and one conference exhibit (the conference was directed towards primary care physicians). The physicians who provided us with feedback did not have reservations about study procedures, and almost unanimously approved of our physician-endorsed reminder letter, commenting that it was short and to the point. Pilot study physicians were also contacted for feedback. Six physicians responded and all stated that their experience was positive and that they would participate again.

In obtaining the cooperation of referring physicians, facility staff assisted project staff. Facility staff identified 23-31 of the most frequently referring physicians to their facility. Project staff sent a packet containing the following: an introductory cover letter, letter of support from the facility medical director, pilot study results, a sample of the physician-endorsed reminder letter, and a chart stating the responsibilities of participating physicians and the project staff. In each packet was a self-addressed stamped envelope and form to be signed indicating the physician's participation. Follow-up calls were made until a response from each physician was obtained.

Physicians were encouraged not to modify their patient recall or referral patterns during the course of the study, nor to discuss the study with their patients. They were told they would be providing a blanket consent that potentially covers any of their referred patients who meet the other inclusion criteria. During physician recruitment, we reassured physicians that the control group would receive a reminder delayed by only 2 months. After a physician was recruited, project staff acquired the physician's stationery in an organized manner. During the subject recruitment phase (June 1995 - April 1997) physicians were sent a list of their patients participating in the study every few months. At the end of subject recruitment a comprehensive list of patients recruited were sent to each physician. Physicians received copies of the letters that were sent to patients in the physician endorsement reminder group at the end of the intervention phase. Physician recruitment was completed in June, 1996.

### Subjects

Subjects were recruited in monthly waves over a 23-month period. Inclusion criteria were: a) age 50-74 (at the time of entry mammogram); b) no history of breast cancer; c) had routine screening mammogram at facility during the course of the study with negative test results; d) referring physician for entry mammogram agreed to the intervention protocol; e) consented to participate; and f) spoke either English or Spanish. Criterion c made the assumption that the woman was asymptomatic. Ongoing studies in progress in San Diego that confounded results of the present study were determined. Subjects who participated in the clinical arms of the Women's Health Initiative, were excluded from the present study.

Prior to starting subject recruitment four focus groups were conducted with: African American women, Filipino/Caucasian women, Latinas, and Caucasian women. Questions were regarding telephone interview questions, the intervention letter, and subject recruitment strategies. Modifications to the telephone interview were made as a direct result of the feedback we received. For example, women objected to a series of questions regarding reasons for and timing of their three most recent mammograms. In the final version of the telephone interview, women were only asked about one of their prior mammograms. We were told repeatedly to keep the interview as short as possible. Another important finding was that women were split regarding preferences for introduction to the study by mailings versus in person - thus we attempted to reach all

potential subjects by letter and phone before their mammography appointments. During the Latina focus group, wording/translations for medical terms like breast lump, clinical breast exam, and breast self-exam were clarified.

Participation rates of women in the study were maximized by: a) incorporating the recruitment and consent procedures into the mammography appointment and providing comprehensive training for the facility staff; b) both before and if necessary, after, the mammography appointment we contacted women by phone and/or mail to explain the project, c) employing mature, sensitive female interviewers who received comprehensive training, d) pilot testing the survey instrument and script for clarity, sensitivity, and duration and making necessary refinements, e) assuring confidentiality of responses, and f) for Latinas who prefer Spanish, providing Spanish language materials and a bilingual interviewer.

Subjects were recruited and written consent obtained near the time of the initial (entry) mammogram. Prior to this appointment, the appointment schedule containing information about inclusion criteria (e.g., physician consents, age, no breast cancer history) was highlighted. Research assistants attempted to reach all eligible subjects by phone before their appointments to explain the project. At three facilities (UCSD, Lybrand, Tri-City) we had access to eligible women's addresses; packets (containing an introductory letter and consent forms) were mailed in addition to the phone calls. Every afternoon a list of eligible subjects due for mammograms the next day was faxed to each facility. Two times a week research assistants determined which women were eligible but did not fill out consent forms; these women were re-contacted by phone and if still willing to participate, were mailed another consent packet.

The facility receptionists and mammography technologists received training by project staff to: a) briefly describe the study to the potential subject before or after the appointment, b) encourage the patient to read a brief description of the project (available in Spanish and English), c) provide the consent form (Spanish and English) and address any questions or concerns, and d) obtain written consent and provide a copy of the form to the patient. Although the test results for the mammogram were not available at the appointment, obtaining consent at that time maximized participation rates and was efficient from a recruitment perspective. Patients whose test results subsequently were found to be positive or inconclusive were excluded as subjects. Women were included in the study if the interpreting radiologist recommended the next screening in one year. Potential subjects also were provided a self-addressed stamped envelope in case they preferred to read the information at home. Facility staffs' rates of recruitment and recruitment style were monitored by staff and feedback was given, as appropriate.

Subjects consented to participate in the study as a whole including a) the phone survey, b) random assignment to study conditions, and c) monitoring of mammography adherence. Women who refused survey participation at the time of the interview were dropped as subjects. One month prior to the targeted appointment month for a given

wave, subjects in the wave (within referring physician within facility) were randomly assigned to one of the three study groups.

### Inclusion of Minorities

Because language may have been a barrier to participation in the study for San Diego's largest ethnic minority group, Latinos, two subject recruiters and two phone interviewers were bilingual in English and Spanish. The explanatory letter, consent form, and survey were translated into Spanish and Spanish-speaking women who were contacted for the survey had the choice of being interviewed in Spanish or English. Additionally, subjects who indicated a preference for Spanish in the interview received their intervention reminder letters in Spanish. Women who speak neither English nor Spanish were excluded as subjects.

### Intervention Procedures

The intervention was implemented in monthly waves; the first wave of subjects were due for their targeted mammograms in June, 1996. All subjects in a wave received their study entry mammogram during the same calendar month. In order to simplify the mailing and monitoring procedures, the following occurred: a) the month of the subject's entry appointment was the designated month of the targeted appointment, irrespective of what day of the month it occurred; b) reminders were timed to arrive on or about day 1 of the targeted appointment month; c) the primary interval in which adherence was assessed for all subjects is 60 days, beginning with day 1 of the designated appointment month; and d) for secondary analysis, facility appointment records are being monitored for an additional 4 months (6 months from day 1 of the targeted appointment month) for subject returns. The uniform mailing date for each wave dictated the uniform outcome monitoring period for each wave. The procedures for each study group are detailed below.

Group 1. The control group (within each facility and wave) received no reminder during the outcome monitoring period for that wave. However, after the interval, they received the "standard" (Group 2) reminder.

Group 2. These subjects received the standard reminder on the facility letterhead prior to the targeted appointment month, as described above. All participating facilities reached consensus on the wording of the standard facility reminder letter. The letter a) stated that it has been a year since the last mammogram, b) encouraged the patient to call her physician to schedule a clinical breast exam and obtain a mammography referral c) encouraged the patient to call for a mammography appointment, and d) provided the facility's name, address, and phone number. A sample of the standard facility reminder is attached (Appendix A).

Group 3. These subjects received the "physician endorsement" reminder letter on the referring physician's letterhead with his/her signature prior to the appointment month. In most cases the project purchased signature stamps to facilitate the timely mailings of the

letters (some physicians decided to sign the letters). The content was the same as the standard reminder letter; the main difference was that the letter was from the physician rather than the facility. A sample of the physician endorsement reminder letter is also attached (Appendix B).

Project staff collected samples of the reminder letters used by the participating facilities as well as reminder letters used in similar studies. These samples were considered when drafting the final version of the reminder letters.

### Measures and Assessment Procedures

The primary sources of data in the proposed study are patient self-report (i.e., the pre-intervention survey) and archival records maintained by the facilities (i.e., patient appointment data for measuring outcome). The measures are described in detail in the following sections.

#### Pre-intervention Survey

Purpose and content. A telephone interview was conducted with subjects to obtain data for describing the sample and for developing models to predict subsequent mammography adherence. The 43-item survey is attached (Appendix C). The items included:

- demographics: birthdate, education, ethnicity (and language preference, if Latina), marital status, employment status, income;
- provider variables: regular source of medical care, type of practice, is referring physician regular physician, specialty of referring physician;
- insurance coverage: type(s) of coverage;
- breast health history: previous breast complaint, previous breast cancer (exclude), previous biopsy, family history;
- screening history: total number of mammograms, dates of mammograms, reason for mammogram (diagnostic vs. screening), test results (if entry mammogram was diagnostic or had non-negative results, exclude), perceived screening pattern (e.g., sporadically, regularly-not annually, annually), perceived barriers (if not annually), perceived facilitators (if annually), ever had CBE, date of last CBE, reason for last CBE, perform BSE, BSE frequency;
- knowledge/beliefs: ACS mammography guideline for 50+, odds of any woman getting breast cancer, odds of subject getting it, age-related risk;
- intentions to have mammogram next year: likelihood in general, likelihood if doctor recommends;

- expectations for having mammogram next year: confidence in being able to schedule and complete the appointment (i.e., self-efficacy), confidence that annual screening will improve survival (i.e., outcome expectation);
- recent mammography experience: general satisfaction with experience, level of discomfort during compression.

Although women with a history of breast cancer or a non-negative study-entry mammogram were excluded based on facility records, items assessing these criteria were included in the survey as a safety measure. Facility records were used to generate basic demographic data for survey nonresponders (e.g., age). Additionally, all women who declined to participate during the recruitment call or telephone interview were asked to answer seven questions regarding demographics and reason(s) for not participating.

Information regarding the study inclusion mammogram was obtained from facility logs or records. History of mammograms prior to this relied on self-report. Self-report of mammography was found to be highly accurate in one study (20) and fairly accurate but overestimating the recency of the exam (i.e., exam was less recent than reported) in another study (21). Previous interval adherence was assessed by asking the number of previous mammograms obtained and by asking the subject to describe her pattern. The intervention outcome does not rely on self-report.

Subcontract for Telephone Interviews. We researched six research firms located in San Diego County and asked about their: specializations, interviewer selection process and training, quality control measures, data handling, cost, and references. After conducting informational interviews over the phone, we visited two of the firms. We determined that each firm had more resources to ensure the quality of the interviews than we would at our office and could conduct the interviews at a lower cost than that originally budgeted.

We chose to work with Luth Research, a firm with over 20 years of experience. Luth has a 50 line WATS phone facility supervised by up to three managers at a time. One supervisor walks around the room and listens to interviews in progress and one listens to interviews in progress and has the ability to edit the interview if he/she detects an interviewer error (unknown to the interviewee). Via modem, we had the ability to "listen" to interviews in progress as well. Luth Research uses Query software for their Computer-Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) system. The CATI system guides interviewers through survey questions and allows them to enter data as women answer questions. The quality and efficiency of Luth's work for the project were excellent.

Procedures. For each subject at each site, the research assistants (R.A.s) generated a telephone interview cover sheet with a woman's phone number and most convenient time to call. Subjects were phoned at the time they specified as most convenient. A minimum of 20 attempts were made to contact each woman whose phone number appeared to be current, and attempts were made to update old numbers. If a woman refused to

participate in or complete the interview once it began, she was thanked politely; no coercion was used.

The interviewer introduced herself and verified language preference and personal breast cancer history. After the introduction, the interviewer proceeded with the 20-minute interview. The interviewer entered information into the computer as each question was answered, clarifying questions as needed, using the CATI system. Interviewers kept records of completed calls, refusals, and call backs on telephone interview cover sheets provided by the project.

### Measurement of Outcome

The dependent variable, mammography adherence, was assessed by the R.A.s from appointment records maintained at each facility. R.A.s were blind to subjects' study group assignment. The time frame monitored (for each wave) was 60 days, beginning on day 1 of the target appointment month. (Subjects in Groups 2 and 3 received their reminder letters immediately prior to this date). Appointment records also were used to determine if any subjects scheduled an appointment prior to intervention for either a screening or diagnostic mammogram; these subjects' data were deleted from the analysis. Adherence was coded dichotomously (yes, no) and required that the appointment be completed (i.e., both scheduled and kept) during the 60-day interval. Additionally, records are currently being monitored to determine whether subjects return for a mammogram within 6 months of the first day of the targeted appointment month.

### Other Measures

Process data included: a) the number of facilities that were approached to reach the quota, b) cooperation rates of referring physicians, c) survey response rates, d) perceptions of facility staff about the intervention procedures, e) perceptions of cooperating referring physicians about the intervention, f) use of systematic reminder strategies (in addition to project's) by physicians, and g) study participation rates by subjects.

### Statistical Analysis

The primary hypothesis was that the physician endorsement letter would yield the highest adherence rate, followed by the standard letter, and no letter would yield the lowest rate. In addition to the analyses to evaluate this hypothesis, secondary analyses examined relationships between baseline demographic, psychosocial, health-related, health services, and mammography-experience related variables and subsequent mammogram adherence, controlling for study condition.

To date, preliminary analysis has been conducted with final analyses in progress. First, selected baseline variables were compared across the three groups to assess comparability. Chi-square tests for categorical variables and one-way analysis of

variance for continuous variables were used. Because groups were comparable, a simple approach to assessing differences across adherence rates for all 1,562 subjects was to construct a 3x2 contingency table for the two categorical variables, study condition and adherence outcome, and use a chi-square test. Because the chi-square result was significant, pairwise contrasts were performed to assess specific differences using a Bonferroni adjustment. The CATMOD procedure in the SAS statistical package was employed.

For a more comprehensive analysis which will yield greater precision, we will perform a multiple logistic regression (22) where the outcome variable will be adherence/non-adherence to the mammogram. This procedure will allow identification of important baseline variables that may predict adherence, consistent with the secondary goal of the study and, if necessary, adjustment for baseline variables in assessing differences among the study conditions for the survey completers. We also will evaluate possible differences among the six radiology facilities and whether differences among study conditions may vary by facility.

## Results

### Facility Recruitment

A total of 13 facility directors were approached and 6 (46%) of those agreed to participate in the study. Reasons for non-participation included: changes in the healthcare system (i.e., facility recently changed ownership/affiliation), facility already too busy/lack of resources, and low mammography screening volume.

### Physician Recruitment

At each facility, 23-31 of the most frequently referring physicians were identified by mammography facility staff. Physician recruitment has been completed and physician participation rates varied across facilities: 67% at South Bay Radiology, 64% at UCSD Center for Women's Health, 48% at Lybrand Mammography and Education Center, 48% at Tri-City Medical Center, 45% at Alvarado Breast Center, and 35% at Mercy Hospital (see Table 1 below). Overall, 82 physicians participated in the study from various specializations: 25 (30%) Obstetrics/Gynecology, 23 (28%) Internal Medicine, 16 (20%) Family Practice, 6 (7%) General Practice, and 12 (15%) from other specializations. The most common reasons physicians cited for not participating in the study were: "too busy, no time" (even though we explained participation would require only 5-10 minutes total) and "not interested."

Table 1  
Referring Physician Recruitment Rates

Participation Status	Facility						All Facilities
	South Bay	UCSD	Lybrand	Alvarado	Mercy	Tri-City	
Participating	18 (67%)	16 (64%)	14 (48%)	14 (45%)	8 (35%)	12 (48%)	82 (51%)
Not Participating	9	9	15	17	15	13	78
Total Approached	27	25	29	31	23	25	160

## Subject Recruitment

Subject recruitment rates varied at the six facilities: 76% of eligible women consented at the Alvarado Breast Center, 62% at UCSD Center for Women's Health, 54% at Lybrand Mammography and Education Center, 50% at Tri-City Outpatient Imaging Center, and 36% at Mercy Hospital. At South Bay Radiology, 44% of English-surname eligible women consented while 19% of Spanish-surname women consented for an overall rate of 31% (see Table 2 below).

Over the course of the 23 month recruitment period, we identified and approached 3,701 eligible women. Of those women, 1,971 consented to participate in the study. Of the 1,971 consenting women, 108 women subsequently had positive mammograms and were excluded from the study, leaving 1,863 study subjects.

Table 2  
Subject Recruitment by Facility

Facility	Participation Status		
	# Eligible <sup>1</sup>	# Consented	# Normal Mammograms (Study Subjects)
Facility 1: South Bay Radiology English Surname	399	175 (44%)	154
Facility 1: South Bay Radiology Spanish Surname	477	93 (19%)	81
Facility 2: UCSD Center for Women's Health	886	549 (62%)	525
Facility 3: Lybrand Mammography & Education Center	373	200 (54%)	187
Facility 4: Alvarado Breast Center	685	519 (76%)	485
Facility 5: Mercy Hospital	25	9 (36%)	7
Facility 6: Tri-City Medical Center	856	426 (50%)	424
All Facilities	3701	1971 (53%)	1,863

### Subject Attrition

Subject attrition rates varied among the six facilities: 22% of subjects recruited at UCSD Center for Women's Health were subsequently excluded, 19% at South Bay Radiology, 14% at the Alvarado Breast Center, 14% at Mercy Hospital, 12% at the Tri-City Outpatient Imaging Center, and 9% at the Lybrand Mammography and Education Center. Reasons for subject attrition are presented below in Table 3.

Table 3  
Reasons for Subject Attrition

Reason	Percent of all subjects excluded from the study
Concurrently Enrolled in the Women's Health Initiative	39%
Returned to Facility Prior to Targeted Appointment Month	31%
Physician-Related Issues (e.g., physician retired)	17%
Refused Telephone Interview	6%
Wrong Age	3%
Other / Miscellaneous	2%
Deceased	2%

### Survey Data

Overall, 1,818 telephone interviews were completed; interviewing concluded in September, 1997. Of the 1,863 subjects recruited, 18 (1%) women refused the survey and were excluded from the study. Interviewers were unable to reach 27 (1%) women; these subjects remain in the study.

### Outcome Data

The intervention for the first wave of subjects was implemented in June, 1996. Primary outcome data collection was completed in June, 1998. Five hundred and twenty three subjects were randomly assigned to the control group, 519 to the standard facility reminder group, and 520 to the physician-endorsed reminder group. Secondary outcome data collection (i.e., return for mammography within 6 months of the first day of the targeted appointment month) will be completed in November, 1998.

Table 4 on the following page examines the comparability among the intervention groups on seven characteristics: type of insurance, family history of breast cancer, education, ethnicity, marital status, family income and age. The groups did not differ on any of these factors suggesting that randomization was successful.

The following tables describe the main results of the preliminary analysis comparing the three intervention groups with respect to the primary outcome: returning within the 8-week monitoring period. Table 5 displays return rates by group. The overall difference among the return rates was highly significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). Table 6 presents the Bonferroni pairwise comparisons among the groups. There was no difference between the physician-endorsed and standard facility groups. However, both of these groups had significantly higher return rates than the control group.

Table 5  
Comparisons of Return Rates

Group	Return Rate	Group Size
Physician-Endorsed	47.7% (248)	520
Standard Facility	46.6% (242)	519
Control	28.3% (148)	523
$\chi^2 = 51.3$ (2 df), $p\text{-value} < 0.001$		

Table 6  
Multiple Comparisons with Bonferroni Adjustment\*

Comparison	Chi-Square	p-value
Physician-endorsed vs. Standard facility	0.12	0.73
Physician-endorsed vs. Control	41.6	$< 0.001^{**}$
Standard facility vs. Control	37.4	$< 0.001^{**}$

\* Each comparison tested at  $0.05/3 = 0.017$  level of significance

\*\* Significant at 0.017 level of significance

Table 4  
Comparisons of Groups on Selected Characteristics

	Physician- Endorsed % (n)	Standard Facility % (n)	Control % (n)	p-value
Type of Insurance				0.95
None	4.7 (24)	4.6 (23)	4.7 (24)	
Medicare only	1.4 (7)	1.8 (9)	2.1 (11)	
No Medicare but other	66.2 (339)	64.6 (326)	66.9 (345)	
Medicare and other	27.7 (142)	29.0 (146)	26.4 (136)	
Family History of Breast Cancer	31.1 (156)	25.4 (123)	30.7 (154)	0.09
Education				0.20
< 8th grade	2.5 (13)	4.0 (20)	2.9 (15)	
8-11th grade	3.9 (20)	2.8 (14)	4.9 (25)	
High school graduate	20.5 (105)	22.8 (115)	23.7 (122)	
Post high school, trade school	2.5 (13)	3.4 (17)	4.1 (21)	
1-3 years of college	36.7 (188)	33.9 (171)	31.5 (162)	
College graduate	14.7 (75)	17.1 (86)	18.6 (96)	
Some graduate work	19.1 (98)	16.1 (81)	14.4 (74)	
Ethnicity				0.25
Non-Latina white	87.0 (443)	83.8 (423)	83.5 (430)	
Latina	6.5 (33)	9.3 (47)	7.2 (37)	
African American	2.2 (11)	3.2 (16)	4.3 (22)	
Other	4.3 (22)	3.8 (19)	5.1 (26)	
Marital Status				0.54
Married / living as married	64.1 (325)	64.8 (326)	61.7 (316)	
Widowed	12.6 (64)	11.9 (60)	14.8 (76)	
Divorced / separated	20.3 (103)	20.1 (101)	18.4 (94)	
Never married	3.0 (15)	3.2 (16)	5.1 (26)	
Family Income				0.18
< \$20,000	20.8 (93)	15.1 (67)	18.3 (80)	
\$20,001 - 40,000	35.1 (157)	40.2 (178)	39.8 (174)	
≥ \$40,001	44.1 (197)	44.7 (198)	41.9 (183)	
Age: mean (sd)	60.0 (7.3)	60.5 (7.5)	60.2 (7.5)	0.60

### Participating Physician Questionnaire

Upon completion of the intervention, a 13 item questionnaire was mailed to 67 of the participating physicians regarding the intervention and the study in general. We were unable to approach 15 of the 82 physicians recruited due to relocation or retirement. Multiple attempts were made to reach physicians (i.e., re-mailing the questionnaire, mailing a shortened version of the questionnaire with 4 items, making reminder calls). Forty-three full and 2 post card questionnaires were completed by physicians (67%). In general, participating physicians were satisfied with the PER reminder system; 73% of respondents reported that they were "somewhat" or "very satisfied." The majority (71%) of physicians stated that it was "somewhat" or "very likely" that they would continue to participate in the PER reminder system program. The questionnaire is attached (Appendix D) and results are presented below.

Table 8  
Physician Questionnaire Results

		N=45
<hr/>		
General Level of Satisfaction with the Physician-Endorsed Reminder Letter (PER):		
Very satisfied		49%
Somewhat satisfied		24%
Neutral		16%
Somewhat dissatisfied		2%
Very dissatisfied		9%
Percent Whose Patients Commented on the PERs (to the Physician or his/her Staff)		54%
Percent who Endorsed the Following Potential Advantages of the PER:		
Encourages patients to schedule an annual exam		80%
Encourages patients to return to the mammography facility		42%
Saves time for physician and his/her staff		42%
Patients like it		36%
Helps my relationships with patients		29%
Helps my relationship with the mammography facility		13%
Percent who Endorsed the Following Potential Disadvantages of the PER:		
Did not like providing my letterhead		5%
Would rather send own reminder		5%
Patients do not like the PER		0%
Likelihood that Physician will Continue to Participate in this Reminder System Program (if offered):		
Very likely		46%
Somewhat likely		25%
A 50/50 chance		7%
Somewhat unlikely		5%
Very unlikely		18%

## Mammography Facility Interviews

We interviewed mammography facility personnel after primary outcome data collection was completed to get their perceptions of the intervention and the study procedures in general. At five of the facilities in-person meetings were held; one facility preferred to fill out a questionnaire. Overall, facility personnel had positive comments about the study but shared concerns regarding the time and resources needed to institutionalize the PER reminder system. Questions for mammography facility staff are attached (Appendix E) and results are summarized below.

Table 9  
Mammography Facility Interview Results

	N=6
Mean Number of Hours Currently Spending Generating Reminder Letters per Month	2.2
Mean Number of Hours Willing to Spend Generating Reminder Letters per Month	3.3
Percent of Participating Facilities who have Software Capable of Generating Reminder Letters	83%
Likelihood that the Facility Would Generate PERs if Found to be Significantly More Effective than Standard Facility Reminder Letters:	
Very likely	0%
Somewhat likely	17%
A 50/50 chance	33%
Somewhat unlikely	0%
Very unlikely	50%
Reasons Facility Would not be Likely to Send out PERs:	
Current system in place is effective	
Would need to do a cost-benefit analysis comparing PERs to facility reminders	
Patients do not like change	
Too much organization is necessary	
Will create more work	
Have more control sending reminders on our letterhead	
Too time consuming	
Some women have more than 1 physician	
Overall Impressions of the Study:	
Study had very little impact on our staff	
Project staff was excellent	
Patients felt special/honored to participate	
It was easy to participate; did not impact our ability to deliver care	
Project staff was professional, polite	
Project staff was very organized, did the work for us	

## CONCLUSIONS

This randomized controlled trial tested the effectiveness of a physician-endorsed reminder letter as compared to a standard facility reminder letter and a control group. The preliminary results of this study indicated that irrespective of source, mailed reminder letters increased mammography screening return rates. Thus, both physicians and mammography facilities should be encouraged to institutionalize these strategies.

In addition, we also have explored the rates and correlates of discomfort associated with mammography. One of the graduate assistants working on the project focused on this topic for her Master's thesis and subsequently a manuscript was completed. The manuscript is currently under review.

Project activities to be completed in the upcoming year include: full analysis of the 2-month outcome data; collection, entry, and cleaning of secondary outcome data (i.e., return for mammography within 6 months of the first day of the targeted appointment month); additional data analysis; manuscript preparation; and presentation of study results to the scientific community, participating physicians, mammography facility staffs, and study subjects.

## REFERENCES

1. American Cancer Society. (1998). Cancer Facts and Figures-1998. Atlanta: American Cancer Society.
2. National Cancer Institute. (1986). Cancer control objectives for the Nation: 1985-2000. P. Greenwald & E.J. Sondik (Eds.). NCI Monographs, NIH Publication No. 86-2880, Number 2.
3. Gohagan, J.K., Rodes, N.D., Blackwell, C.W., Darby, W.P., Herder, T., Pearson, D.K., Spitznagel, E.O., & Wallace, M.D. (1980). Individual and combined effectiveness of palpation, thermography, and mammography in breast cancer screening. Preventive Medicine, 9, 713-721.
4. Howard, J. (1987). Using mammography for cancer control: An unrealized potential. Ca - A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 37, 33-48.
5. Rimer, B.K. (1992). Understanding the acceptance of mammography by women. Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 14, 197-203.
6. NCI Breast Cancer Screening Consortium. (1990). Screening mammography: A missed clinical opportunity? Journal of the American Medical Association, 264, 54-58.
7. Centers for Disease Control. (1990). Use of mammography - United States, 1990. Morbidity & Mortality Weekly Report, 39, 621-630.
8. Stomper, P.C., Kopans, D.B., Sadowsky, N.L., et al. (1988). Is mammography painful? A multicenter patient survey. Archives of Internal Medicine, 148, 521-524.
9. Howe, H.L. (1992). Repeat mammography among women over 50 years of age. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 8, 182-185.
10. Lerman, C., Rimer, B., Trock, B., Balshem, A., & Engstrom, P.F. (1990). Factors associated with repeat adherence to breast cancer screening. Preventive Medicine, 19, 1-12.
11. Zapka, J.G., Stoddard, A., Maul, L., & Costanza, M.E. (1991). Interval adherence to mammography screening guidelines. Medical Care, 29, 697-707.
12. Costanza, M.E., D'Orsi, C.J., Greene, H.L., Gaw, V.P., Karellas, A., & Zapka, J.G. (1991). Feasibility of universal screening mammography. Archives of Internal Medicine, 151, 1851-1856.
13. Kendall, C., & Hailey, B.J. (in press). The relative effectiveness of three reminder letters on making and keeping mammogram appointments. Behavioral Medicine.
14. Mayer, J., Bartholomew, S., Clapp, E.J., & Elder, J. (1994). Facility-based inreach strategies to promote annual mammograms. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 10, 353-355.
15. Macharia, W.M., Leon, G., Rowe, B.H., Stephenson, B.J., & Haynes, B. (1992). An overview of interventions to improve compliance with appointment keeping for medical services. Journal of the American Medical Association, 267, 1813-1817.
16. Wolosin, R.J. (1990). Effect of appointment scheduling and reminder postcards on adherence to mammography recommendations. Journal of Family Practice, 30, 542-547.

17. McDowell, I., Newell, C., & Rosser, W. (1989). Computerized reminders to encourage cervical screening in family practice. Journal of Family Practice, 28, 420-424.
18. Pierce, M., Lundy, S., Palanisamy, A., Winning, S., & King, J. (1989). Prospective randomized controlled trial of methods of call and recall for cervical cytology screening. British Medical Journal, 299, 160-162.
19. Rimer, B.K., Trock, B., Engstrom, P.F., Lerman, C., & King, E. (1991). Why do some women get regular mammograms? American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 7, 69-74.
20. King, E.S., Rimer, B.K., Trock, B., Balshem, B.A., & Enstrom, P. (1990). How valid are mammography self-reports? American Journal of Public Health, 80, 1386-1388.
21. Degnan, D., Harris, R., Ranney, J., Quade, D., Earp, J.A., & Gonzalez, J. (1992). Measuring the use of mammography: Two methods compared. American Journal of Public Health, 82, 1386-1388.
22. Hosmer, D.W., & Lemeshow, S. (1989). Applied logistic regression. NY: Wiley.

## APPENDIX A

### Standard Mammography Facility Reminder Letter



Scripps Memorial Hospitals

**The Lybrand Mammography  
and Education Center**

9888 Genesee Avenue  
Post Office Box 28  
La Jolla, California 92038-0028

(619) 626-6224  
(619) 626-6261 FAX

September 30, 1997

Recommended month for next mammogram: October, 1997

Dear Ms. :

Your last mammogram at The Lybrand Mammography and Education Center was approximately one year ago. For women in your age category, the American Cancer Society recommends routine screening mammography each year, along with yearly clinical breast exam and monthly breast self-examination. Currently, you are due for your annual mammogram.

Please call your personal physician at your earliest convenience to obtain a referral for your next mammogram. You also should make an appointment with him/her for your annual clinical breast exam.

We look forward to seeing you.

Sincerely,

The Lybrand Mammography and Education Center  
(619) 626-6224

## APPENDIX B

### Physician Endorsement Reminder Letter

ROBERT P. BROUILLARD, M.D., F.A.C.P.

Internal Medicine  
Hematology and Oncology

9850 Genesee Avenue, Suite 830  
La Jolla, CA 92037  
Telephone (619) 552-1410

September 30, 1997

Recommended month for next mammogram: October, 1997

Dear Ms. :

Your last mammogram at The Lybrand Mammography and Education Center was approximately one year ago. For women in your age category, the American Cancer Society recommends routine screening mammography each year, along with yearly clinical breast exam and monthly breast self-examination. Currently, you are due for your annual mammogram.

Please call me at 552-1410 at your earliest convenience to schedule an appointment for your annual clinical breast exam and to receive your mammography referral. Once you obtain your referral, call The Lybrand Mammography and Education Center at 626-6224 to make an appointment for your annual mammogram.

I look forward to seeing you.

Sincerely,



Robert P. Brouillard, M.D., F.A.C.P.

APPENDIX C

Telephone Survey

## PICTURE OF HEALTH MAMMOGRAPHY PROJECT TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_, with the Picture of Health Mammography Project. May I speak with \_\_\_\_\_? Hello \_\_\_\_\_, this is \_\_\_\_\_ of the Picture of Health Project. When you had your last appointment at \_\_\_\_\_ you signed a letter of consent to participate in our study; one part of the study is this telephone interview. At this time we would like to ask you some questions regarding mammography and breast cancer, in general. I expect this telephone interview to take about 15 - 20 minutes. Is this a good time for you to answer these questions?

*(If not, ask if there is a better time to call. Thank the subject for her time and let her know we will call her back at the convenient time she specified).*

Before I begin to ask you the questions, I would like to confirm that you have never had breast cancer -- for this study we are focusing only on women who have never had breast cancer. Have you had breast cancer?

*(If yes, thank woman for her time, politely end interview)*

O.K., then let's get started. As you answer, remember that we just want you to answer openly; there are no right or wrong answers.

### **Provider Variables** - DO NOT READ QUESTION HEADINGS

- 1. Is there a particular doctor's office, clinic, health center or other place that you usually go to if you are sick or need advice about your health?**

1=yes

2=no (GO TO QUESTION #3)

8=don't know (GO TO QUESTION #3)

2. **What kind of place is it - a doctor's office, a hospital, a clinic, a health center or some other place? (CHECK ONLY ONE)**

01=doctor's office (private office or group practice)

02=hospital emergency room

03=hospital outpatient clinic

04=health center

private health clinic

private neighborhood health clinic

05=public health clinic

06=HMO/prepaid group practice, "group health"

07=Kaiser facility

08=Cigna health plan facility

09=PPO; preferred provider organization

10=medical facility (type not listed above)

3. **Our records show that Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ referred you for your most recent mammogram. Is he/she your regular doctor?**

1=yes

2=no

4. **What type of doctor is he/she?**

1=family or general practice

2=internist

3=gynecologist

4=other

8=don't know

5. **Are you presently covered by any of the following kinds of health insurance? ARE YOU COVERED BY...?**

(READ LIST AND RECORD A RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM):

**A. Commercial insurance, like Blue Cross, Prudential, or Medigap?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

**B. A Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) or Individual Practice Association (IPA) like Kaiser or Maxicare?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

**C. Preferred Provider Option?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

**D. Medicare?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

**E. Medical?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

**F. Secure Horizons?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

**G. Any other health insurance?**

1=yes, specify: \_\_\_\_\_

2=no

8=don't know

**Health History**

6. **Has a doctor ever told you that you had a lump or tumor in your breast or breasts?**

1=yes

2=no

7. **Have you ever had a biopsy of your breast, in which a small segment of tissue was removed or a needle was used to extract fluid?**

1=yes

2=no (GO TO QUESTION #9)

8=don't know (GO TO QUESTION # 9)

8. **Did you have a surgical biopsy where a small segment of tissue was removed or was a needle used to extract fluid?**

1=surgical biopsy

2=needle aspiration biopsy

8=don't know

9. Is there a history of breast cancer in any one of the following members of your family? Remember we are talking only about breast cancer. (READ):

**A. your mother?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

**B. any sister?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

**C. any grandmother?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

**D. any aunt?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

**E. any daughter?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know OR

**F. any granddaughter?**

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

10. Have you ever been told by a doctor that you have fibrocystic breasts, a condition that is not cancer but that makes your breasts feel lumpy or sore most of the time?

1=yes

2=no

8=don't know

**Breast Cancer Screening History**

11. Prior to your recent mammogram, had you ever had a mammogram before?

1=yes

2=no (GO TO QUESTION #17)

**12. Including the last one, how many mammograms have you ever had? \_\_\_\_\_**  
(IF WOMAN CANNOT GIVE AN EXACT NUMBER, ASK FOR AN ESTIMATE)

**13. Prior to the mammogram you had in the past few weeks, when was the mammogram you had before that?**

- 1=less than 1 year
- 2=over 1 year ago
- 3=over 2 years ago
- 4=over 3 years ago
- 5=over 4 years ago
- 6=over 5 years ago
- 7=6 - 10 years ago
- 8=more than 10 years ago
- 9=don't know

**14. Why did you have that mammogram...because you had a breast problem or for a routine check-up, that is, you did not have any symptoms (problems)?**

- 1=had a breast problem
- 2=routine check-up

**15. Have you ever had a mammogram where the results were NOT normal or the results were inconclusive?**

- 1=yes
- 2=no (GO TO QUESTION #17)
- 8=don't know (GO TO QUESTION #17)

**16. What happened as a result of the mammogram with abnormal or inconclusive results?**

- 1=had a second mammogram
  - 2=had a biopsy (negative)
  - 3=other/specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- 

**17. How would you describe your pattern of having routine mammograms?**  
(READ LIST):

- 1=have had only one or have them sporadically (GO TO QUESTION #18)
- 2=have had them every 2-3 years on a regular basis (GO TO QUESTION #18), OR
- 3=have them annually (GO TO QUESTION #19) ?

18. I'm going to mention several reasons that may explain why you do not have annual mammograms. Please tell me how much each reason applies to you. Your options are: applies to you a great deal, applies somewhat, or does not apply at all. The first reason is... (READ OPTIONS):

**A. "my doctor doesn't recommend it annually"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**B. "someone other than my doctor recommended against annual mammograms"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**C. "I'm concerned about radiation"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**D. "the exam is painful"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**E. "there are financial reasons, cost, my insurance does not cover it at all or not annually"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**F. "it's not necessary, I have no problems, all previous exams have been fine"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**G. "I don't think about it"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**H. "I'm too busy"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**I. "I have no family history of breast cancer"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**J. "I procrastinate"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**K. "I do not think it is important"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**L. "thinking about mammography makes me anxious"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**M. "I fear that they'll find something"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**N. "I'm embarrassed"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**O. "I don't have transportation"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**P. "I'm in poor health"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**Q. Are there any other reasons? (SPECIFY):** \_\_\_\_\_

19. **I'm going to mention several reasons that may explain why you have annual mammograms. Please tell me how much each reason applies to you. Your options are: applies to you a great deal, applies somewhat, or does not apply at all. The first response is... (READ OPTIONS):**

**A. "my doctor recommends it"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**B. "organizations such as the American Cancer Society recommend it"**

1=applies a great deal

2=applies somewhat, OR

3=does not apply at all ?

**C. "my friends, family, others recommend it"**

- 1=applies a great deal
- 2=applies somewhat, OR
- 3=does not apply at all ?

**D. "it is effective in detecting cancer early"**

- 1=applies a great deal
- 2=applies somewhat, OR
- 3=does not apply at all ?

**E. "I want peace of mind"**

- 1=applies a great deal
- 2=applies somewhat, OR
- 3=does not apply at all ?

**F. "it is convenient"**

- 1=applies a great deal
- 2=applies somewhat, OR
- 3=does not apply at all ?

**G. "I have a family history of breast cancer"**

- 1=applies a great deal
- 2=applies somewhat, OR
- 3=does not apply at all ?

**H. "I'm afraid I'll develop breast cancer"**

- 1=applies a great deal
- 2=applies somewhat, OR
- 3=does not apply at all ?

**I. "I have a history of benign breast problems (cysts, etc.)"**

- 1=applies a great deal
- 2=applies somewhat, OR
- 3=does not apply at all ?

**J. "it's the sensible thing to do"**

- 1=applies a great deal
- 2=applies somewhat, OR
- 3=does not apply at all ?

**K. Are there any other reasons? (SPECIFY): \_\_\_\_\_**

- 20. I want you to think about the mammogram you had most recently. When the mammography equipment was pressing against your breasts during the X-ray, how did you feel? (READ):**

- 1=no physical discomfort
- 2=slight physical discomfort
- 3=moderate physical discomfort
- 4=substantial physical discomfort OR
- 5=extreme physical discomfort ?

21. **A physical breast examination is when the breast is felt for lumps by a doctor or other health professional. Have you ever had a physical breast examination?**

1=yes

2=no (GO TO QUESTION #24)

8=don't know (GO TO QUESTION #24)

22. **When did you have your last physical breast examination?**

1=less than 1 year

2=over 1 year ago

3=over 2 years ago

4=over 3 years ago

5=over 4 years ago

6=over 5 years ago

7=6 - 10 years ago

8=more than 10 years ago

9=don't know

23. **Why did you have your last physical breast exam...Because you had a breast problem or for a routine check-up, that is you did not have any symptoms (problems)?**

1=had a breast problem

2=routine check-up

24. **Do you examine your own breasts for lumps or other changes?**

1=yes

2=no (GO TO QUESTION #26)

8=don't know (GO TO QUESTION #26)

25. **How often do you examine your breasts?**

\_\_\_\_\_ times per

\_\_\_\_\_

day

\_\_\_\_\_

week

\_\_\_\_\_

month

\_\_\_\_\_

year

\_\_\_\_\_

other/specify: \_\_\_\_\_

88=don't know

**Knowledge/Beliefs**

26. **How often is routine mammography recommended for women in your age range (50 and older) by experts such as the American Cancer Society?**

1=never  
2=every 2 -5 years  
3=annually  
4=once  
5=only when there's a problem  
6=other/specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
8=don't know

27. **What proportion of women do you think will get breast cancer at some time during their lives? Do you think it is...(READ CHOICES):**

1=1 in 4  
2=1 in 8  
3=1 in 25, OR  
4=1 in 50 ?  
8=don't know (DO NOT READ THIS ALTERNATIVE)

28. **What are your chances of getting breast cancer sometime during your lifetime? Do you think it is...(READ CHOICES):**

1=1 in 4  
2=1 in 8  
3=1 in 25, OR  
4=1 in 50 ?  
8=don't know (DO NOT READ THIS ALTERNATIVE)

29. **Are women 50 years and older more likely, less likely, or equally likely to get breast cancer than women younger than 50?**

1=more likely  
2=less likely  
3=equally likely  
4=other/specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
8=don't know

### **Intentions**

- 30. What is the likelihood that you will have another routine screening mammogram next year, even if your doctor does not suggest one? Is it...(READ):**

1=very unlikely  
2=somewhat unlikely  
3=a 50/50 chance  
4=somewhat likely, OR  
5=very likely ?

- 31. If your doctor recommends one, what is the likelihood that you will have another routine screening mammogram next year? Is it...(READ):**

1=very unlikely  
2=somewhat unlikely  
3=a 50/50 chance  
4=somewhat likely, OR  
5=very likely ?

### **Efficacy and Outcome Expectations**

- 32. How confident are you that you will be able to schedule a mammogram appointment in the next 12 months (i.e., phone for an appointment, schedule it at a convenient time, etc.)? Are you...(READ):**

1=not at all confident  
2=slightly confident  
3=somewhat confident  
4=fairly confident, OR  
5=very confident ?

- 33. How confident are you that you will be able to complete the appointment once it is scheduled (i.e., drive yourself or obtain transportation, get the money and/or insurance to pay for the mammogram, etc.)? Are you...(READ):**

1=not at all confident  
2=slightly confident  
3=somewhat confident  
4=fairly confident, OR  
5=very confident ?

34. **How confident are you that having annual mammograms will improve your chances of survival if you have breast cancer? Are you...(READ):**

1=not at all confident  
2=slightly confident  
3=somewhat confident  
4=fairly confident , OR  
5=very confident ?

**Recent Mammography Experience**

**For the next 3 questions, I want you to think again about your most recent mammogram experience. Please answer these questions openly; your answers will not be shared with mammography facility staff. I will read a statement, and I'd like you to tell me how much you agree or disagree with it...(READ):**

35. **"I was very satisfied with the care I received."  
Do you (READ):**

1=strongly disagree  
2=disagree  
3=neutral  
4=agree, OR  
5=strongly agree ?

36. **"I feel confident that the mammogram was taken properly."  
Do you (READ):**

1=strongly disagree  
2=disagree  
3=neutral  
4=agree, OR  
5=strongly agree ?

37. **"The person was too rough when taking the mammogram."  
Do you (READ):**

1=strongly disagree  
2=disagree  
3=neutral  
4=agree, OR  
5=strongly agree ?

**Demographic Information**

**38. In what month and year were you born?**

(date: month \_\_ , year \_\_ )

**39. What was the highest level of education that you completed?**

1=less than eighth grade

2=8th grade to 11th grade

3=high school graduate

4=post high school, trade or technical school

5=1 -3 years of college

6=college graduate

7=some graduate work or graduate degree

**40. Which of the following best describes your ethnic or racial group? (READ):**

1=white, or Caucasian, not of Hispanic origin

2=Mexican American, Mexican/Mexicano, Hispanic, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Chicano,  
other Latin American, or other Spanish

3=African American

4=American Indian

5=Asian

6=Pacific Islander

7=other/specify: \_\_\_\_\_

**41. What is your present marital status?**

1=married or living as married

2=widowed

3=divorced

4=separated

5=never married

**42. What is your current employment status?**

1=working at a full-time job

2=working at a part-time job

3=not working, but looking for work

4=a full-time homemaker

5=a non-salaried volunteer

6=retired

7=unable to work due to disability

8=other/specify: \_\_\_\_\_

**43. Please stop me when I get to the category that best describes your family's total annual income. Is it... (READ):**

1=less than \$10,000

2=10,001 to 15,000

3=15,001 to 20,000

4=20,001 to 25,000

5=25,001 to 30,000

6=30,001 to 40,000

7=40,001 to 50,000

8=50,001 and over

9=don't know (DO NOT READ THIS OPTION)

10=refused (DO NOT READ THIS OPTION)

**WE ARE NOW FINISHED WITH THE TELEPHONE INTERVIEW. ON BEHALF OF THE PICTURE OF HEALTH STAFF, I'D LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND INTEREST IN THE STUDY. YOUR INPUT IS VERY VALUABLE TO US.**

**HAVE A GOOD DAY/EVENING...**

## APPENDIX D

### Participating Physician Questionnaire

Picture of Health Mammography Project  
Participating Physician Questionnaire

Name (Optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Specialization: \_\_\_\_\_

Participating facility(ies) you refer to (check all that apply):

- ☐ Alvarado Breast Center
- ☐ Lybrand Mammography & Education Center
- ☐ Mercy Women's Imaging Center
- ☐ Scripps South Bay Imaging
- ☐ Tri-City Outpatient Imaging Center
- ☐ UCSD Center for Women's Health

**First we want to thank you again for your participation in this study - your cooperation was crucial to the success of the project. As we near the end of the study we are interested in hearing your perceptions of the study. In order to help you answer some of the following questions, we'd like to provide you with some general information about the study.**

**As you know we have been testing a reminder letter we call the "physician-endorsed reminder letter" or "PER". The letter is similar in content to letters many mammography facilities send to remind women about their annual mammograms. The PER is unique because the letter is printed on a woman's referring physician's letterhead and "signed" by her physician (for this project we primarily used signature stamps). Please see the attached sample PER.**

**At this time we are interested in finding out:**

- 1) your perceptions of the PER**
- 2) your interest in future research projects**

**Perceptions of the PER**

- 1. Please rate your general level of satisfaction with the PER - the letters that appeared to be coming from you encouraging your patient to have a mammogram? Circle one:**

1	2	3	4	5
very	somewhat	neutral	somewhat	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied		satisfied	satisfied

2. **What were the advantages of the PERs?**

**(check as many as apply):**

- ☐ patients like it
- ☐ helps my relationships with patients
- ☐ helps my relationship with the mammography facility
- ☐ encourages patient to schedule an annual exam
- ☐ encourages patients to return to the mammography facility
- ☐ saves time for me and my staff
- ☐ other: please describe \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

3. **Did your patients comment on the PERs?**

**(check as many as apply):**

- ☐ patients mentioned the letters to me
- ☐ patients mentioned the letters to the appointment scheduler
- ☐ patients mentioned the letters to the receptionist
- ☐ patients mentioned the letters to the nurse(s)

4. **If your patients commented on the PERs, please summarize their comments below:**

---

---

---

5. **What were the disadvantages of the PERs?**

**(check as many as apply):**

- ☐ didn't like providing my letterhead
- ☐ patients don't like it
- ☐ I would rather send my own reminder
- ☐ other: please describe \_\_\_\_\_

---

6. **What suggestions do you have for improving the PERs? Please be specific.**

---

---

---

7. **Do you currently use any other systematic reminder strategy to facilitate mammography screening (checklist, chart prompt, etc.)?**

- ☐ yes: please describe \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ no

**Intentions for the Future**

8. **How likely is it that you would continue to participate in this system (mammography facility you refer patients to will send your PER to your patients)? Circle one:**

1	2	3	4	5
very unlikely	somewhat unlikely	a 50/50 chance	somewhat likely	very likely

9. **Please skip this question if you circled 4 or 5 for question #8 above. If you circled 1, 2, or 3 for question #8, why would you not be likely to participate? Please be specific.**

---

---

---

- 10 **With all other factors (e.g., cost of mammogram, quality, etc.) being equal, would you be more or less likely to refer a patient to a radiology facility that sends PERs (compared to a facility that does not send them)? Check one:**

- ☐ more likely  
☐ less likely  
☐ equally likely

11. **Would you be interested in collaborating with our research team on similar studies?**

- ☐ yes  
☐ no

12. **If so, what type(s) of studies would interest/benefit your practice? Please be specific.**

---

---

---

---

13. **Other comments?**

---

---

---

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND INTEREST!  
PLEASE RETURN THIS SURVEY IN THE POSTAGE PAID  
ENVELOPE ATTACHED**

## APPENDIX E

### Mammography Facility Interview

Picture of Health Mammography Project  
Mammography Facility Staff Survey

Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Facility: \_\_\_\_\_

**First we want to thank you again for your cooperation in implementing this study - your help was crucial to the success of the project. As we near the end of the study we are interested in hearing your perceptions of the study and exploring the possibility of incorporating this system into your routine procedures (depending on the results of the study). In order to help you answer some of the following questions, I'd like to provide you with some general information about the study.**

**As you know we have been testing a unique reminder letter we call the "physician-endorsed reminder letter" or "PER". The letter is similar in content to letters many mammography facilities send to re-call women for their annual mammograms. The PER is unique because the letter is printed on a woman's referring physician's letterhead and "signed" by her physician (for this project we primarily used signature stamps).**

**\*\*SHOW SAMPLE PER LETTER**

**At your facility we recruited \_\_\_\_\_ physicians and sent the PERs to approximately 1/3 of their patients who consented to be in the study. On average, we prepared \_\_\_\_\_ PERs per month for your facility. Since we used the physicians' actual letterhead we had to print the letters in groups by physician. Next we used a rubber signature stamp to give the appearance that the letter was signed. It took approximately \_\_\_\_\_ hours to generate these letters per month. It may be possible to further streamline these procedures (i.e., use mock physician letterhead, scan physician signatures into computer).**

**At this time we are interested in finding out :**

- 1) your perceptions of the PER**
- 2) your current resources for implementing the PER system**
- 3) your interest in future research projects**

### **Perceptions of the PER**

1. Did your patients comment on the PERs - the letters that appeared to be coming from the women's physicians encouraging them to have a mammogram?

☐ yes

☐ no (Go to #3)

2. If your patients commented on the PERs, what were the nature of their comments?

---

---

---

3. What were your overall impressions of the Picture of Health Mammography project?

---

---

---

4. Did the participating physicians who refer to your facility comment about the PERs or the Picture of Health Mammography Project in general?

☐ yes

☐ no (Go to #6)

5. What was the nature of the physician's comments?

---

---

---

### **Your Resources**

6. How many hours do you/your staff currently spend generating reminder letters per month? \_\_\_\_\_

7. How many hours would you/your staff be willing to spend generating reminder letters per month? \_\_\_\_\_

8. (For all facilities except ABC) What type of computer program do you use to manage patient records?

---

4

9. Do you currently have software capable of generating reminder letters?

- ☐ yes, the program is: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ no
- ☐ I don't know

10. If you do not have software capable of generating reminder letters, would you be willing to purchase software for this purpose?

- ☐ yes, I would be willing to spend: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ no

**Intentions for the Future**

11. If the PER letters are found to be significantly more effective than standard facility reminder letters, how likely is it that you would start generating PERs at your facility? Would it be (READ):

- 1=very unlikely
- 2=somewhat unlikely
- 3=a 50/50 chance
- 4=somewhat likely or (Go to #13)
- 5=very likely? (Go to #13)

If 1, 2, or 3 above...

12. Why wouldn't your facility be likely to send out the PERs? Please be specific.

---

---

---

13. How likely is it that your facility would start generating PERs if we provided on-site training and technical assistance? Would it be (READ):

- 1=very unlikely
- 2=somewhat unlikely
- 3=a 50/50 chance
- 4=somewhat likely or
- 5=very likely?

14. Would you be interested in collaborating with our research team on similar studies?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no (Go to #16)

**15. If so, what type(s) of studies would interest/benefit your facility? Please be specific.**

---

---

---

**16. Other comments?**

---

---

---